



IPSWICH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Spatial Planning Working Group
Date	02 October 2012
Time	13:00
Location	Grafton House
Present	Steve Miller (Chair) (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Nicole Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) Joanne Cave (David Lock Associates) (JC) Gail Broom (Urban Design and Conservation) (GB) Jason Wakefield (IBC Drainage) (JW) Anita Seymour (IBC Planning) (AS) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Iain Maxwell (SCC) (IM) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Felicia Blake (IBC Minutes) (FB)
Apologies	Steve Haines (DLA)
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	Minutes of the meeting dated 10 September 2012 was agreed as an accurate record.

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of last meeting and matters arising		
1.1	Agency consultation is to be re-issued.		
1.2	There were no comments noted, regarding the Urban Context Study Report issued by DLA (September).		

2.0	Minutes of DSG and CSP		
2.1	SPD Boundary was resolved and agreed at the Development Steering Group meeting of the 11 September.		
3.0	Retail report for discussion and comments to DSG		
3.1	SM and Laurence Collins will attend a meeting with Aecom and Vectos this week to discuss and reach a consensus on transport issues.	SM/LC	
4.0	Update on Issues and Options report and Draft Options Plan		
4.1	Discussions took place with regard to Options and how to progress going forward – The main points clarified were;		
4.2	The draft land use budget for the development as currently set out in Table 2 of the Draft Issues and Options Report provides a set of working assumptions for the SPD. The Report states “it is anticipated that the volumes of development set out in Table 2 will be refined further in order to achieve the right balance between housing, open space, and infrastructure.”		
4.3	As discussed there is a clearly a degree of tension between the need to accommodate sufficient land for housing to achieve overall viability of the proposed urban extension and the amount of public open space required.		
4.4	It was agreed that further work was necessary in respect of the Options and that neither the currently expressed figure for housing nor that for open space should be regarded as sacrosanct at this stage depending on considerations of viability and good planning and urban design.	DLA/IBC	
4.5	Further dialogue took place with regard to housing, with lower density being the desired option from the developer’s point of view .		
4.6	IBC sited general concern for the lack of provision of green space in the heart of the development.		
4.7	NP suggested a revision of the Options mapping colour scheme – It was felt the colour yellow would equate to “cement”, which was deemed unappealing.		
4.8	DLA agreed to look at the Options and revise; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key components and constraints - Produce diagrams for more open and green space, which also reflected IBC’s aims and objectives - Re-work and reduce numbers based on a density 	DLA	

	<p>of 32 public open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjust and revise the land adjacent to the railway - Look at access roads for Red House Farm/Lower Road and amend annotations - Ensure the schedule addressed issues from the Community Workshop - Circulate these new results to the SPWG via email 		
4.9	Steve Haines will do a presentation at the next Community Steering Panel – DLA proposed to submit revised options to IBC by the 11 th October.	DLA	
4.10	IBC committed to modifying Option 4 (Officer's Draft) to answer all comments and feedback received.	IBC	
4.11	IBC suggested 100ha was not sacrosanct and would need to be looked at.		
4.12	<p>IM had concerns on;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option 1 – Generally too much school segregation from the rest of the development. - Option 2 – Locating schools which backed onto housing - Option 3 – Secondary schools to be more centrally placed to the development 		
5.0	Call for Ideas		
5.1	Robert Hobbs responded to comments made by Rod Brooks of Northern Fringe Protection Group in relation to prematurity – This is now available on the IBC website at www.ipswich.gov.uk/northernfringe		
5.2	DLA will add this to the appendix on the Issues and Options report.	DLA	
6.0	Secondary School Requirements		
6.1	AS apprised the group on the national projections for the rise in pupil population based on the ONS up to the period of 2020 – Pupil numbers were on the increase.		
6.2	FL proposed looking at viability issues to see whether it was financially workable – AS offered to look into this.	AS	
7.0	Study Tour Details		
7.1	No further discussion.		
8.0	Brett Energy report		
8.1	Work is on-going.		
9.0	Infrastructure Update		

9.1	This item will be prepared and discussed at the next DSG.		
10.0	Freedom of Information		
10.1	No further discussion.		
11.0	AOB		
11.1	PS will have discussions with DLA to make plans for the public exhibitions commencing in December/January 2013.	PS	
11.2	PS confirmed the Special CSP meeting arranged for the 9th October was now cancelled as the Draft Issues and Options report provided by DLA was not yet ready for circulation – FB will send an email to CSP members to inform them of this.	FB	
11.3	NM requested a comprehensive schedule of upcoming meetings to be circulated to the group – FB agreed to compile and distribute this.	FB	
11.4	JC made apologies for not being able to attend the next SPWG – Steve Haines penciled in to stand in as sub for DLA and make the presentation for the Draft Issues and Options.	DLA	
12.0	Date of next meeting		
12.1	The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Thursday 25 th October, 10.30am at Grafton House.		

The full minutes of this meeting are assumed to be accessible to the public and to staff, unless the chair claims an exemption under the **Freedom of Information Act 2000**. For detailed guidance about applying the exemptions visit <http://www.ico.gov.uk/>



Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.

Remember that some exemptions can be overridden if it is in the public interest to disclose – as decided by the FOI multi-disciplinary team.

Exemptions normally apply for a limited time and the information may be released once the exemption lapses.

These minutes contain information;

Please insert an "x" if relevant

1. That is **personal data**

2. Provided in **confidence**

3. Intended for **future publication**

4. Related to **criminal proceedings**

5. That might prejudice **law enforcement**

6. That might prejudice ongoing **external audit** investigations

7. That could prejudice the **conduct of public affairs**

8. Information that could endanger an individual's **health & safety**

9. That is subject to **legal privilege**

10. That is prejudicial to **commercial interests**

11. That **may not be disclosed by law**

12. **Other** Please describe